



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/519,314	12/23/2004	Marcus Guzmán	102792-390(1105104)	9126
27389	7590	04/08/2008		
NORRIS, MCLAUGHLIN & MARCUS			EXAMINER	
875 THIRD AVE			DOUYON, LORNA M	
18TH FLOOR				
NEW YORK, NY 10022			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1796	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/08/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/519,314

Applicant(s)

GUZMANN ET AL.

Examiner

Lorna M. Douyon

Art Unit

1796

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 December 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 10-15 and 18-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 10-15 and 18-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB-08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

1. This action is responsive to the amendment filed on December 27, 2007.
2. Claims 1-8, 10-15, 18-34 are pending.
3. The rejection of claims 1-6, 8, 11, 12, 13, 15, 17, 29-31 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Roberts et al. (US Patent No. 3,728,446) is withdrawn in view of Applicants' amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

4. Claims 1-8, 10-15, 18-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1-4 are indefinite in the recital of "wherein radiation emitted by the gel interacts with radiation emitted by the primary particles" because it is not clear why or how the gel or the primary particles emit radiation.

The remaining claims, being dependent upon the above claims, are rejected as well.

The amendment to claims 5, 12, 16-21, 23, 25, 31 and 34 in response to the previous office action's rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph is appreciated.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102/103

5. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
6. Claims 1-8, 10-15, 20-22, 24, 26-32 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Smerznak et al. (WO 99/00477), hereinafter "Smerznak".

Smerznak teaches a non-aqueous, particulate-containing liquid laundry detergent compositions which are in the form of a suspension of particulate material, essentially including colored speckles and preferably including peroxygen bleaching agent and an organic detergent builder, dispersed in a liquid phase preferably structured with a surfactant (see abstract). The speckles range in particle size to about 400 to 1500 microns and have a density less than about 1.4 g/cc, and the speckles comprise dye or pigment material in combination with a carrier which can be polyethyleneglycol (reads on plasticizer), polyacrylate or a polysaccharide (see page 2, lines 23-26) such as celluloses (see page 12, lines . Additional insoluble particulate material is also preferably suspended in the surfactant-containing liquid phase, wherein the particulate material can include peroxygen bleaching agents, bleach activators, organic detergent builders and inorganic alkalinity sources, having a size in the range from about 0.1 to 1500 microns (se page 2, last full paragraph). The additional solid phase particulate material which is dispersed and suspended within the liquid phase comprises from about 1% to 50% by weight (see page 13, lines 1-4). The preferred particulate material

is a peroxygen bleaching agent which is coated with silicate, borate, sulfate or water-soluble surfactants (see page 13+). The composition can also include microencapsulated enzymes (see page 18, lines 4). The detergent composition may also optionally contain a polymeric material which serves to enhance the stability of the composition, and may thus act as thickeners, viscosity control agents and/or dispersing agents, for example, polymeric polycarboxylates like polyacrylates (see page 19 line 15 to page 20, line 4). The water content of the non-aqueous detergent composition should in no event exceed about 5% by weight of the composition (see page 22, lines 6-7) and the viscosity of the compositions ranges from about 300 to 5,000 cps (see page 22, lines 9-14). The compositions can be used to form aqueous solutions for use in the laundering and bleaching of fabrics (see page 24, lines 14-15). In Table II, Smerznak teaches a stable, anhydrous heavy-duty liquid laundry detergent which has pleasing blue speckles suspended throughout a generally opaque liquid composition (see entire page 28). Even though Smerznak does not explicitly disclose the interaction of the radiation emitted by the structured composition and colored speckles forming a third or fourth color, it would be inherent for the structured composition and speckles to exhibit the same characteristics because same ingredients have been utilized. In addition, the transmittance of the composition and migration speed of the speckles in the structured composition would inherently be the same as those recited, considering the viscous nature of the composition, and the presence of the colored speckles. Even assuming the teachings of Roberts are not sufficient to anticipate the claims, it would have been nonetheless obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was

made to reasonably expect the structured composition of Smerznak to exhibit similar, if not the same, characteristics as those recited because similar ingredients have been utilized.

7. Claims 18-19, 23 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smerznak as applied to the above claims.

Smerznak teaches the features as described above. In addition, Smerznak teaches the bleaching agents comprise from about 1% to 30% by weight of the composition (see page 15, first full paragraph); organic builder salts, like alkali metal citrates, in amounts from about 2 to 20% by weight of the composition (see page 15, last paragraph to page 16, line 19); inorganic alkalinity salts in amounts from about 1% to 25% by weight of the composition (see page 16, line 20 to page 17, line 9); and inorganic detergent builders in amounts from about 2 to 15% by weight of the composition (see page 17, lines 18-28). Smerznak also teaches coated percarbonate and microencapsulated enzymes (see page 13, last two lines; page 14, lines 1-2; and page 18, lines 4-5). Smerznak, however, fails to disclose the composition having a salt content of at least 70% and wherein the salt comprises phosphate, citrate or sulphate; and the proportions of the encapsulating agent with respect to the particles.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to optimize the proportions of the salt and the encapsulating agent through routine experimentation for best results. As to optimization results, a patent will not be granted based upon the optimization of result effective variables when the

optimization is obtained through routine experimentation unless there is a showing of unexpected results which properly rebuts the *prima facie* case of obviousness. See *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272,276,205 USPQ 215,219 (CCPA 1980). See also *In re Woodruff* 919 F.2d 1575, 1578, 16 USPQ2d 1934, 1936-37 (Fed. Cir. 1990), and *In re Aller*, 220 F2d 454,456,105 USPQ 233,235 (CCPA 1955).

8. Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smerznak as applied to the above claims, and further in view of Fonsny (US 4,846,992).

Smerznak teaches the features as described above. Smerznak, however, fails to disclose the composition in a pouch of polyvinylalcohol.

Fonsny teaches a similar composition which is gel-like (see abstract and col. 15, lines 15-20) and which is packaged in pre-measured dosage forms for single use in pouches formed from water soluble materials such as polyvinyl alcohol (see col. 16, lines 3-10).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to package the composition of Smerznak in a pouch made from polyvinyl alcohol because it is known from Fonsny that a similar composition can be packaged in pre-measured dosage forms in pouches formed from water soluble materials such as polyvinyl alcohol for ease in dispensing.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicants' arguments filed December 27, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With respect to the anticipation, or in the alternative, obviousness rejection based upon Smerznak, Applicants argue that the limitations of claim 17, i.e., the gel has a water content of from 5% to 65%, which claim was not rejected as anticipated or obvious over Smerznak, was incorporated into claims 1-4, thereby overcoming this reference.

Upon careful review of this reference, the Examiner respectfully disagrees with this argument because, as stated above, Smerznak, on page 22, lines 6-7, teaches that the water content of the non-aqueous detergent composition should in no event exceed about 5% by weight of the composition. Accordingly, the rejections based upon Smerznak are maintained.

With respect to the obviousness rejection of claims 18-19, 23 and 25 based upon Smerznak and claim 33 based upon Smerznak in view of Fonsny, Applicants argue the same reasoning as above.

The response above applies here as well.

Conclusion

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lorna M. Douyon whose telephone number is 571-272-1313. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays-Fridays 8:00AM-4:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Harold Pyon can be reached on 571-272-1498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Lorna M. Douyon/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1796

